

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 EASTERN DIVISION

11 DAVID GAMBOA,) Case No. 2:23-CV-08959-GW (DTB)
12)
13 Petitioner,)
14 v.) **ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**
15) **REGARDING FAILURE TO**
16 OFFICER BANUELOS, et al.,) **UPDATE ADDRESS**
17 Respondent.)

18
19 On September 25, 2023, David Gamboa (“Plaintiff”), a county jail inmate
20 proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, together
21 with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Eastern District of California.
22 (Docket Nos. 1, 2.) On October 19, 2023, the matter was transferred to the Central
23 District of California. (Docket No. 5.) On November 7, 2023, plaintiff was granted
24 leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (Docket No. 8.) On November 22, 2023, the
25 matter was transferred to this Court’s calendar. (Docket No. 11.)

26 Named in the Complaint are the following defendants: Officer Banuelos
27 (“Banuelos”), Officer Munoz (“Munoz”), Officer Park (“Park”), Parole Officer
28 Harris (“Harris”), Leslie Del Rio (“Rio”), Jerry A. Ammonds (“Ammonds”),

1 Rebecca Reynoso (“Reynoso”), Zarifa Ismaila Gamboa (“Gamboa”), Sofia Barez
2 (“Barez”), Chanel Rainey (“Rainey”), Mercedes Mendoza (“Mendoza”), Leah
3 Harding (“Harding”), Eric Santos (“Santos”) and Katherynn D. Deleon (“Deleon”).

4 On December 27, 2023, separate orders regarding further proceedings were
5 issued regarding Plaintiff’s Complaint. The Court ordered service of the Complaint
6 on defendants Banuelos, Munoz, Park, Harris, Rio, Ammonds, Reynoso, Deleon,
7 Barez, Rainey, Mendoza, Harding and Santos in their individual capacities and
8 advised Plaintiff that they were unable to order service on defendant Gamboa
9 without additional identifying information.

10 On February 1, 2024, defendants Deleon, Harding and Santos filed Answer.
11 (Dkt. # 30.)

12 On February 2, 2024, defendants Rio, Mendoza and Rainey filed a Motion to
13 Dismiss. (Dkt. # 31.) On February 5, 2024, the Court issued a Minute Order setting
14 a briefing schedule on the Motion to Dismiss filed by defendants Rio, Mendoza and
15 Rainey. (Dkt # 35.)

16 On February 6, 2024, defendants Munoz and Park filed an Answer. (Dkt. #
17 33.)

18 On March 19, 2024, defendants Ammonds and Reynoso filed a Motion to
19 Dismiss. (Dkt. # 40.) On March 20, 2024, the Court issued a Minute Order setting
20 a briefing schedule on the Motion to Dismiss filed by defendants Ammonds and
21 Reynoso. (Dkt. # 41.)

22 On March 28, 2024, defendants Munoz and Park filed a Motion to Dismiss
23 pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(c). (Dkt. # 42.) On April 1, 2024, the Court issued a
24 Minute Order setting a briefing schedule on the Motion to Dismiss filed by
25 defendants Munoz and Park. (Dkt # 43.) On April 10, 2024, defendants Munoz and
26 Park filed a Request to Update the Record. (Dkt. # 44.)

27 ///

28 ///

1 On April 15, 2024, the Court received its Minute Order filed April 1, 2024
2 (Dkt. # 43) returned from the institution marked as “Return to Sender Not in
3 Custody.” (Dkt. # 45.)

4 Pro se litigants are required to keep the Court and opposing parties apprised
5 of their current address. Central District of California Local Rule 41-6. Therefore,
6 plaintiff is ordered to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack
7 of prosecution and failing to comply with the Court’s Local Rules. Plaintiff may
8 alternatively file a Notice of Change of Address to discharge this Order to Show
9 Cause. Plaintiff’s response is due no later than **May 17, 2024**.

10 **Plaintiff is hereby cautioned that failing to comply with this Order may**
11 **result in the recommendation that this action be dismissed without prejudice**
12 **for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the Court’s Local Rules.**

13
14 Dated: 4/19/2024


15 DAVID T. BRISTOW
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28